UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Thunder Over America! - *Brent Dow Allinson*

Legislation, Revelation, Education - - - - - - - - - *S. H. Markowitz*

Intellectual Chastity - *Randall S. Hilton*

The Free Individual and the Free Society - - - - - - - - *Victor S. Yarros*

THE STUDY TABLE

VOLUME CXXIII NUMBER 5

Chicago, May 1, 1939

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly *Subscription $3.00*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY, Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Publication Committee

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, Chairman
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-Chairman
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MR. JAMES E. TUCKER

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
TARAKNATH DAS
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
FRED W. SHORTER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Washington Correspondent

BRENT DOW ALLINSON

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—

Notes 67
Jottings—J. H. H. 70

ARTICLES

Thunder Over America!—BRENT DOW ALLINSON 70
Legislation, Revelation, Education—S. H. MARKOWITZ 74
Intellectual Chastity—RANDALL S. HILTON 76
The Free Individual and the Free Society—VICTOR S. YARROS ... 77

POETRY—

Golgotha '39—HOWELL SHEPARD 73
Voices in the Wilderness—HANNA MOCK 75
Partitions—GEORGE R. SMALL 76

STUDY TABLE—

A Study of Empire—GEORGE MAYCHIN STOCKDALE 78
An Important Historical Document—MICHAEL B. SCHELER 78

THE FIELD—

The Jews and the Arabs—H. N. BRAILSFORD 66
The Real Presence—ROBERT WHITAKER 80

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

The Jews and the Arabs

H. N. BRAILSFORD

The critics who marveled at the calling of a conference in London to discuss the problem of Palestine will suffer no disappointment. There has been no conference. Some ceremonies have been staged in St. James' Palace, and ministers have talked separately, but to little purpose, with the Arab and Jewish delegations.

Obedient to the instructions of the ex-Mufti of Jerusalem, whose rebel forces still wage a war of terrorism against the British, the Jews and their more moderate fellow-countrymen, the Palestinian Arabs have stubbornly refused to sit in the same room with the Jews. They stand by their claim for independence, and reject absolutely both the Balfour declaration that promised a Jewish national home in Palestine, and the League's mandate which instructed Great Britain to watch over its building.

There is no basis, then, for negotiation. The British Government may have derived some benefit from its conversations, more especially with the Arab states (which have even condescended to meet the Jews), but it will presently have to face all the intractable facts and impose its own solution.

This little country is a focal point in two closely connected problems. It has become a pawn in the struggle—"the bloodless war," as Mr. Churchill has called it—between the axis, which wants power at any cost, and the western democracies, which aspire to appeasement at the same price.

It is no secret that the Arab rebels have been armed, financed, and encouraged by Rome and Berlin. This aid and incitement has continued in spite of Mr. Chamberlain's achievement at Munich.

If the British have been the chief sufferers hitherto, it is probable that the French will soon experience in their mandated area of Syria the reckless enterprise of the axis. A wireless station which seems to be in Libya is now directing the Arab conspirators in Syria to distribute arms to their followers. The moment is skillfully chosen.

The French, after negotiating with the Syrians a treaty that gives them a qualified independence on the model of Iraq, are now with doubtful wisdom postponing ratification, with the natural result that this mixed population, always difficult to govern, is restless and suspicious.

In the second place, we may soon expect the presentation of the Italian demands to France. Franco, assured of unconditional recognition from London and Paris, has made his triumphal entry into Barcelona at the head of 17,000 Italian troops; a formidable Italian army, in defiance of the Rome agreement, has been concentrated once more in Libya; the ostentatious military preparations of the Duce's Ger-

(*Continued on page* 80)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXIII MONDAY, MAY 1, 1939 No. 5

"FATHER, FORGIVE THEM"

Most Merciful and Loving Father, we beseech Thee most humbly, even with all our hearts, to pour out upon our enemies with bountiful hands whatsoever things Thou knowest may do them good: and chiefly a sound and uncorrupt mind, wherethrough they may know Thee and seek Thee in true charity with their whole heart, and love us, Thy children, for Thy sake. Let not their first hating of us turn to their harm; neither let us in any wise hurt them, seeing that we cannot do them good for want of ability. Lord, we desire their amendment, not their punishment. Separate them not from us by punishing them, but join and knit them to us by Thy favorable dealing with them. And seeing that we are all ordained to be citizens of the one everlasting city, let us begin to enter into that way here already by mutual love, which may bring us right forth thither. Amen.

(An Elizabethan prayer entitled "For Our Evilwillers," published by the Fellowship of Reconciliation.)

MAY DAY!

This used to be a great day for labor—and still the Socialists and Communists parade here and there in celebration of the revolution which is to set the workers free. But it is pitiful, the labor cause today! Twenty-five years ago, the workers were a potent influence in public affairs. There were great international conferences in those days, which challenged the authority of government, especially in the field of war and peace. When the crisis came in 1914, there was anxious speculation as to whether the workers would fight. Would they not rather throw down their arms, and even their tools, and paralyze the war machines? But is any premier or president, Fuehrer or Duce, worrying about labor today? If so, we have not heard of it. Labor in many countries has been smashed to bits, and in other countries tamed like sheep for the slaughter. Labor simply does not count any more. It has muddled and messed its business, during the last quarter of a century, far worse than the church. Remember *that,* when the familiar charges of ineptitude and cowardice are raised against religion! Both organized interests, the workers and the religionists, were out for a better world; they wanted to hasten the day of freedom, brotherhood, and peace. And look what they have done, or not done! The failure of the workers is obvious. In the critical hour (1914) they allowed themselves to be changed from workers into soldiers, from trade unionists into patriots, from revolutionists into nationalists. From this betrayal of their own cause, they have never recovered, nor will they recover in this age. Now, on the eve of another war, labor is all lined up on every battle front, primed and prepared for mutual murder. What wonder that this May Day has a sickly air about it! Where are labor's martyrs, that they suffer this thing without complaint? Where, in this new generation, are the men to match Bebel, Liebknecht, Jaures, Keir Hardie, John Burns, and 'Gene Debs? Alas, in this field, as in so many others, the lights have gone out. Best forget May Day and its hallowed memories!

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S PEACE APPEAL

What may happen to President Roosevelt's astonishing peace appeal to Hitler and Mussolini will not in any way affect its great and memorable significance. Like Premier Chamberlain's flight to Berchtesgarten, it remains a gesture of sublime beauty in an hour of awful portent. When all hopes for peace seemed to have been abandoned, when armies and navies were being feverishly rushed into position, when the President himself had apparently committed America to its part in the impending conflict of arms, Mr. Roosevelt, with magnificent audacity, offered his concrete suggestion for appeasement and reconstruction. Here were wisdom and courage at their highest. We liked the President's move because, among other things, it addressed in terms of reason and good will those who we are told can understand no language but that of force. It met the dictator-states at the point of their own grievances, and offered consideration of these grievances in conference, if only the threat of war were lifted. It assumed that the totalitarian as well as the democratic states have a stake in peace, and may be joined in friendly coöperation to the end of peace. This is the antithesis of everything that the warmongers have been screaming since Munich. It is a slap in the face for every hysterical liberal and jittery radical who have said that only war could meet the situation precipitated by the Reich. What we have here, in this action of our President, is the quintessence of pacifist statesmanship. There can be no failure in an undertaking of this sort. Refusals of his proffer are as futile as defiances of the lightning. A flash of light has illumined the black horizon of our time. A thunderbolt of reason has crashed into the chaos of the world's madness and terror. The world

can never be the same again. Peace is a nearer hope than it has been since Wilson's pre-war days.

IS IT DEMOCRACY OR IMPERIALISM?

The same propaganda cry is being used for the next war as for the last war—namely, democracy! Let UNITY go on record, here and now, that it does not believe this cry for a single moment. Nothing could be more specious, or out-and-out dishonest, than the claim that the lineup in Europe is between democracy and tyranny, or that the war, if it comes, will be a fight to protect democracy against tyranny. This claim is nothing in the world but a glossing over of the grim reality—which we now know existed in 1914, and should know still exists today—that the European struggle is nothing in the world but a struggle of competing imperialisms for the control of markets, trade routes, and colonies. There may have been some democratic issue involved in the situation when Czechoslovakia was caught in the meshes of intrigue and violence, but not now when Poland, an out-and-out dictatorship, is to the fore. That we are not quite crazy in thus defining the European crisis, is shown by two recent utterances of genuine significance. The one is by General Hugh Johnson (New York *World-Telegram,* April 8th last), as follows:

> If we are going to war we ought to know what we are going to fight for. We are told it will be for the "democracies" and so we prepare to defend countries in the Western Hemisphere and to rely on arming them and an alliance with them, and we draw closer and closer to association with Britain and France. I earnestly believe in getting ready to defend this hemisphere. But to call that, or this general trend, a defense of "the democracies" is just cynical, cruel, hypocritical sloganeering—precisely the same slicker stuff that drew us into the tragic blunder of 1917.
>
> England is now in alliance with Poland. Poland is a dictatorship. Of twenty-five Latin-American countries at least twenty are dictatorships or communes, and one—Santo Domingo—is about the bloodiest, most savage and vicious dictatorship in the world. And if the coming alliance includes Russia—wouldn't that be the nuts? No dictatorship in the world is so ruthless and deadly or farther from democracy. In any such line-up as is imagined there would be many more dictatorships on our side than on the other. If we are going to get into a war let's not be kidded or sloganeered or bamboozled into it as we were twenty-two years ago.
>
> Well, if it isn't to defend democracy, what is it for? Obviously it is to maintain the existing pattern of empire, trade areas and territorial boundaries. Why not say so? Because not so many Americans would be willing for us to fight to preserve Tunisia for France, for example, as "for democracy."

More important still is Senator Borah's statement of April 13th last, as follows:

> A thorough investigation will disclose that a more sordid, imperialistic war could hardly be imagined than this war should it unfortunately come.
>
> This is not a war over the question of democracy or totalitarianism. It was the democracies of Europe which wrote the secret treaties by which all spoils were divided even before the war was closed. It was the democracies of Europe which wrote the Versailles Treaty, not a peace treaty but a spoils treaty. It was the democracies which refused for twenty-odd years to make any changes in the Versailles Treaty looking toward peace.
>
> We all abhor the doctrines of Naziism and equally vicious doctrines of Communism. But let us not be misled that this war turns upon a wholly different subject.

To keep out of this "sordid, imperialistic war" is our first business. Some days ago the Prime Minister of Canada said, "The idea that every twenty years this country, which has done all it can to run itself, should feel called upon to save periodically a continent which cannot run itself, seems to me a nightmare and sheer madness." If this be true of Canada, how much truer of ourselves?

A LETTER FROM ITALY

The *Jewish Frontier* (April issue, page 5) prints a letter which is the most pitiful commentary on our age which we have seen. It was written by a member of the Kuerschner family, Jews of Hungary, who drowned themselves at Taormina, Sicily, on March 11th last. Dr. Kuerschner had been decorated for distinguished service in the Austro-Hungarian army. The family had been hounded from Germany to Austria. After the Nazi conquest of Austria, they fled to Italy. In Sicily they reached the end of the road. Faced by Mussolini's edict of expulsion, they took a boat and jumped overboard into the blue waters of the exquisite Taormina harbor. The letter written by one member of the family, just before the final act of suicide, is "more eloquent and more accusatory," says the editor of the *Jewish Frontier,* "than any editorial can be." We republish it here without comment:

> Dear Friend:
>
> It has come to this. My 73-year-old mother, my brother Eugene, my sister Renee and I are going to die today, willingly yet unwillingly. The deep ocean may perhaps receive us in a more friendly way than the high governments of the countries hereabouts. We will weight ourselves with rocks so as not to come up again.
>
> Our resolution dates back six months. It was made easier for us through the realization that we had always lived an honorable and useful life, and at times even had some success, and this without any harm to any human being. We owe no accounting to anyone and no bills. We never sought help from anybody and never accepted any.
>
> The last months in Rome and the last weeks in Taormina passed cheerfully and peacefully. For a parting place from life we have selected one of the most beautiful spots.
>
> I remember with pleasure our last hours together in B. and the pleasant exchange of our war and peace remembrances and say a hearty farewell to you and your charming wife.
>
> Yours,
> ARTHUR KUERSCHNER.

A WORLD'S FAIR

This issue of UNITY appears on the day following the official opening of the much-tooted World's Fair in New York. The approach of the natal day has been appropriately heralded by multitudes of pictures in the Sunday rotogravures, numerous strikes by the plumbers, carpenters, and other workers on the last-minute jobs, fierce quarrels over appointments to the 31,000 positions of one kind and another, a furious attack on the manager of the Fair, Grover Whalen, as "a combination P. T. Barnum and David Harum," the raising of prices in the hotels, and fierce headaches over

automobile parking problems. That the Fair will have many impressive exhibits, goes without saying—this glorified county fair has spared no money in seeking attractions of a high as well as a popular order. That the Fair will be in spirit and ultimate purpose pure commercialism, also goes without saying—the circus is in the interest of business, first, last, and all the time. Architecturally, the Fair stands as an unparalled specimen of the modernistic in art. Everything monumental has been sacrificed to an aggregate of scattered units, each complete in itself as a specimen of the bizarre, with no imaginable conception of organized design. In this sense it will be the exact opposite of the immortal 1893 Chicago Fair, and, if we have been correctly informed, of the contemporary San Francisco Fair. You will either like it—or else wildly pinch yourself to wake up from your latest nightmare. The side shows remain as yet a mystery. No "nude ranch" is announced or expected, but all state liquor regulations have been suspended within the Fair grounds, so the booze may be expected to flow like an open faucet. The Temple of Religion is a flop, largely because ministers and rabbis were completely ignored and the planning left to business managers and art directors. If you can imagine a hospital planned without any consultation with doctors, you have an exact picture of how this Temple was projected. Sixty million paid admissions to the Fair are already counted, like chickens in the egg. The free advertising given the show would pay the national debt. Wow!!

TEMPLES OF RELIGION

What is the matter with our age that it fails so egregiously to express itself spiritually? The New York Temple of Religion, referred to above, is only one of several failures of the kind in recent years. Thus, in the recent World's Fair in Chicago, the Temple of Religion was chiefly remarkable for the "fake" chalice of Antioch (so-called). Apart from this spurious article, the Temple had nothing to show but space occupied by some questionable pamphlets and books. The Temple of Religion at the San Francisco Fair was recently exposed in the *Churchman* (see issue for April 1st last). The exhibits in this building consist mostly of 1611 Bibles, "and the impression [is] irresistible that religion is somehow a hangover from the 17th century." This correspondent goes on, as follows:

> The "sanctuary" was small and plain, but an imitation stained glass window looked as though it had been painted on butcher's paper, and was as spiritual as a baked ham, and the smell was of too green lumber and fresh paint. The main hall was full of folding chairs and a few wall paintings of uncertain artistic and religious merit. The idea was to buid a temple which would offend no one, and as it therefore stands for nothing, it is a gorgeous and deserted flop.

The same indictment, that "it stands for nothing," is to be directed against the New York Temple. Deeper than this, of course, is the sheer commercialism of these monstrous fairs, and, deeper still, the inertia of a religion which is willing to allow itself to be expressed in this hopelessly inadequate fashion. One thinks, in contrast, of the Chicago World's Fair of 1893, and the great Congress of Religions gathered together under the leadership of Jenkin Lloyd Jones. This Congress stood for something, all right—the unity of the spirit, the kinship of religions, the universality of faith, and the brotherhood of man in God. The crowning irony of our contemporary performances in this field came in New York when the Temple of Religion was formally and officially dedicated on Sunday, April 30th, at high noon—precisely the day and hour when not a clergyman in the city or environs was able to be present!

GOOD CITIES HAVE FEW CHURCHGOERS

What are the churches going to say in answer to Professor Edward L. Thorndike's announcement, in his recent book, *Your City,* that church membership and attendance are in inverse relation to the rating of cities and towns for general goodness of life? For three years past, Professor Thorndike has been making a survey of American communities from the standpoint of the "general goodness of life for good people." Those communities he ranks highest which are characterized by an abundance of artists, engineers, musicians, nurses and teachers, good schools, low death rate, low infant mortality, less than the average of illiteracy and child labor, high entertainment standards, plentiful home ownership, excellent labor conditions, wide distribution of books, etc. These communities were found invariably to have low records in church life, whereas the communities below average have as invariably the largest percentage of church members and attendants. "Unless the better communities under-report their church membership, or the worse communities over-report theirs," says Professor Thorndike, "we must suspect that the churches are clubs of estimable people and maintainers of traditional rites and ceremonies rather than powerful forces for human betterment." This is one inference, undoubtedly, but we believe it applies to relatively few of the cities studied. Much more important is the demonstration in this survey that the old, evangelical, other-worldly type of religion is still strong among us. This is the very religion—in the South, for example—which is always drumming up church attendance, multiplying memberships through revivals, and supplying in Sunday services and prayer meetings all the outlet that multitudes of ignorant people need, or at least expect. Other factors might be found in this amazing situation. But one thing is clear—that, in this survey, is a smashing refutation of the idea that strong churches mean an enlightened and progressive and wholesome community. There's something wrong with our inherited Christianity. Its lack of so-

cial understanding and vision is the basic ill. This Christianity is losing contact with life. It may flourish a long time as a thing apart, but a new religion is coming into the world which identifies itself with the community in which it operates. This is community religion. In due time it will correct this extraordinary discrepancy noted by Professor Thorndike. Already the best communities are producing the best religion.

Jottings

"Henry had left off comparing 'love' and 'charity' in the Hebrew of St. Paul's Epistle to the Corinthians."—Rachel Field, in *All This and Heaven Too,* page 394.

Henry "left off" this study, probably, to take up the study of the Greek of the Twenty-Third Psalm!

Channing Pollock, the eminent playwright, thinks that a monument should be reared in honor of the man who invented ham and eggs. Amen! And why not a monument also to the hero who first ate a raw oyster?

In the new book, *War in Our Time,* the delightful spectacle is presented of fathers and sons in the trenches waiting anxiously for news of the bombings and bombardments of the women and children at home.

Italy has a population of some 41,000,000 people; Albania a population of something over 1,000,000. Italy has a standing army of more than 650,000 men; Albania an army of 12,000 men. And Mussolini called it a "triumph" when he entered Albania at the rear of his troops!

Romain Rolland is the most popular European author in Russia. During the last five years 1,320,000 copies of *Jean Christophe, The Enchanted Soul,* and *Colas Breugnon* have been sold in the Soviet republic. But what about *Cherambault,* Rolland's great pacifist novel? How many copies has this book sold?

Miss Dorothy Sayers, President of the Modern Languages Association, says she is tired of "the little chatty bits of meaningless uplift turned out to please people with the minds of rabbits."

So are we!

J. H. H.

Thunder Over America!

BRENT DOW ALLINSON

Thunder in Central Europe, on the Capitoline, in Parliament, and in the worried Senate of the United States! . . . One hears it rumbling daily, in Washington—particularly upon the Right, and in the editorial columns of the commercial and conservative press. Not since the spring of 1917 has there been so ominous an atmosphere in Washington, charged with the thunderbolts of angry Mars, if not with the wisdom and the righteous wrath of Jove! Every voice and influence, from that of the Communist press and their "fellow-travelers" in the C. I. O., on the Left, to that of the League of Nations Association and its inexhaustible propagandists for the deceptive formulae of "collective security," the international bankers and munitioneers, the internationalist editorial-writers and propagandists for a "positive" American foreign policy directed against the dictators in behalf of "peace and the democracies" (meaning the preservation of the existing *status quo* and of the commercial empires of Britain, France and their allies, and of the international capitalist and monetary systems which they alone still operate and dominate)—every voice, that is, save the still, small voice of the unbribed peace movement speaking with the accents of American history and uncorrupted American patriotism is chiming in a chorus of warlike utterance, looking hopefully towards the White House and the President. And all of them are engaged in a vast conspiracy to move the United States into the vortex of international politics and the imperialist duel of the Great Powers, as a ponderous moral and military factor, not in appeasement or in overthrowing the ancient, bloodstained balancing of power through diplomatic bluff and intrigue; not towards a new international order of coöperation and concession to and with the underprivileged states and hungry peoples of Central and Southern Europe, but rather acting as a sort of moral Charlie McCarthy to British diplomatic ventriloquism, in an effort designed to cow the dictators into submission by threat and military counterpoise. And to this propaganda, the President lends a ready ear, impatient as he is of constitutional restraints and legislative limitations upon his power to direct the destinies of the American people; and desirous, as most men of extraordinary energy and ability would be, to play a great rôle upon the world's stage.

The issue is one that cuts athwart party lines. It is the old historic issue of ratifying the Treaty of Versailles and joining the post-war League of Victorious Nations, in a new dress. But this time it is even more dangerous to our peace, for the Republicans are not united in their opposition. Mr. Stimson and Mr. Hoover stand as far apart in their conception of the duty and opportunity of American foreign policy in the present crisis as the President and, for example, Senators Clark of Missouri, or Bone of Washington, or George of Georgia, who speak against American diplomatic interventionism in Old World quarrels, and for a positive and even-handed American neutrality policy that moves without fear or favor against big navalism and militarism, against the commercial war-system and the dangerous munitions-traffic; and that denies the current assumption that, if and when war

comes to Europe, America is certain to be involved—and the sooner the better!

Our uneasiness is prompted by the unanimity with which such fatalistic assumption is reiterated—and accepted—in the press; and by the monstrous crimes that have assuredly been committed in Europe and Asia, even although we regard the supposititious menace of the so-called totalitarian-axis—the German-Italian *entente*—to the great commercial and colonial preponderance of the semi-democratic world empires, as being an illusion so far as the United States, or even South America, is concerned, because we believe that what the German people insistently demand they are entitled, for the most part, to have; and because we know that most South Americans fear them and their impudent propaganda less than they fear the financial and military imperialism emanating from the United States.

Since when has it become our "duty," or accepted foreign policy, to assist in preserving the British and French commercial and colonial empires intact, or to promise them munitions and supplies, if not armed men, in a war made inevitable by their policies of dealing with the vanquished foe of twenty years ago, now become a towering Wrath and Fear? Since when have our interests become identified with those of the Bank of England or of France, or with the maintenance of the present inequitable arrangements of property and power in the world? Who are we to say that German domination of Central Europe and even of the Danubian Balkans, with all that this would mean of economic unification and security for these long-suffering peoples, would not be a development in many ways desirable and devoutly wished by those peoples themselves, if they know what is good for them? The German people are not necessarily to be feared—and are not feared by those who know them best and, knowing, believe that, once security and a reasonable standard of life are attained, which their technological skill and social organization make possible, they will free themselves from the cruel torments and tyrannies of the Nazi political machine.

Let us remember that ever since the moral, political, and legal repudiation of the Treaty of Versailles by the Senate and the country, in 1920, a large majority of Americans have repeatedly expressed a desire to dissociate themselves and their foreign policy from the defense of the territorial and economic arrangements established by the diplomats at Versailles, and from the postwar power-politics of Europe. What interests of the United States are threatened by forced changes in those arrangements, especially by changes for the better? Is it doubtful that most of the changes which Hitler has effectuated in Central Europe are for the better, terrible as are his methods? In view of the fact that the Austrian people were condemned to slow starvation by the allies, and deserted by the "democracies" when they sought to establish a democracy of their own, and delivered over first to slow economic strangulation and then to a Catholic-Fascist dictatorship engineered from Rome, is not the "Anschluss" with Germany (prohibited in 1924 by France, by the League, and by the World Court of the Hague, under a loose interpretation of the Treaty of Saint-Germain) wholly natural, however unpleasant because of the men and manner of its final accomplishment? Is not the economic reintegration of all the Danubian countries, in fact—even under the aegis of the German Reich and its present masters—highly desirable? Even the Czechs seem to have accepted it in Bohemia, if not in Chicago,—*for impelling economic reasons!* Men do not live by bread alone; neither can they live without it on a diet of propaganda and theoretical independence. The despots will disappear, if war is avoided, we can be sure. But let us pray that a customs union and political confederation of the whole of Central Europe and the Danube Valley may now be achieved. If it is, Hitler may go down in history as a modern "Scourge of God," rather than as a fiend incarnate. By augmenting the Reich, by expanding its economic union in the Balkans, we venture to prophesy that he is laying the historic groundwork upon which alone something like a workable German Democracy can and ultimately will be built, through peaceful years to come.

Why is it virtually impossible to publish the foregoing views in the United States today—even in the so-called liberal magazines?

Why are our daily newspapers blind and deaf to reason and to peace?

"It is more urgent to save this country now from Roosevelt than from Hitler," recently wired the Director of the National Council for Prevention of War to Senator Borah, prompted by the Administration's vast armament expansion, by its rapid assimilation of its foreign policy to that of the British and French, and by its rash and persistent efforts to undo the Neutrality Acts and abandon their mandatory embargoes against war-loans and the exportation of arms and implements of war, including airplanes, to belligerents. And to accomplish the kind of unlimited executive discretionary authority in the matter of foreign and commercial policy, whose exercise by Woodrow Wilson in a direction contrary to his publicly announced purposes undeniably led this country, by a series of disingenuous steps, into a quixotic partnership with the Anglo-French empires in the tragic World War—to the undoing both of America and of such democracy as there might have been in Europe had the war terminated in a draw and an unembittered peace. Are we to be led with an ideological ring in our nose to repeat that blunder, in the short space of twenty years? The telegram above quoted and the protest of many of the peace organizations against the trend of affairs in Washington, are prompted by a profound distrust of the Executive's uncontrolled re-direction of our foreign policy, in the face of all that has happened and of many years of Congressional effort and legislation aimed to restrain a President's awful power to steer the whole country towards unwanted war, even against the majority will to hold the Ship of State aloof from the whirlpools of imperialism which periodically suck the old empires and civilizations of Europe and Asia into the abyss of military devastation and collective suicide.

President Roosevelt, it has become increasingly clear, is intrigued by the deceptive ideas of "collective sanctions," of "quarantining the aggressor," and of employing "measures short of war,"—meaning commercial boycotts and economic penalties. He is prepared to act alone, without consultation with his allies, or even with the Senate, in the heat of his resentment at the high-handedness of German aggression,—and without considering whether such unilateral and solo embargoes, applied by the President of the United States, are likely to prove, in their consequences, an effective sanction of international order and justice, or

a provocative boomerang, in the present alarming state of this world's affairs. When whole nations are on the march, and the basis of "law and order" and the international system created at Versailles has been undermined, by the triune anathemas of anti-Communism, anti-Capitalism, and anti-Semitism, which Hitler, Himmler, Goebbels, and Streicher, like the foul fiend Flibbertygibbet of Macbeth, have conjured from the awful deeps of human nature; when something like a holy, or unholy, "war against the West" has been launched, indeed, and the entire Central European *status quo* set up by the wiseacres of Versailles has caved in from the weight of its own injustices, iniquities, and economic stupidities, why, in the name of common sense and national interest, does the President venture to disregard the repeated refusals of Congress to grant him the discretionary authority to impose discriminatory economic penalties against foreign nations, (on his own political judgment as to their aggressive iniquity); and why does he rush the country into a program of action where even the angels of Clivden, or Walhalla, fear to tread? Does he, in God's name, *want* a war? Or desire to involve the United States in desperate hazards which common sense would avoid?

Little wonder that the Senate is considering more seriously than ever today the feasibility of writing an amendment, approved now by Senator Borah as well as half a dozen of the well-known more "leftist" leaders, which will require the approval of the American people, through a special nationwide referendum, (not merely of a majority of the Congress), before a declaration of war may be legally issued, or American troops ordered abroad!

The President has gone too far, and too fast, to carry either the country or his own Party with him in this grave matter of armament and of a "positive" foreign policy against the Fascist world-alliance. His response to Hitler's challenge, and to the supposititious menace of the totalitarian "axis" to the United States, has been ardent, emotional and fourfold, reminiscent of Theodore Roosevelt's reaction to the Kaiser's violation of the neutrality of Belgium, and of his desire to plunge into the European affray, in the first month of the World War of 1914-1918. Calmer counsels prevailed then—and we predict that they will prevail now, even if the incidence of a presidential election is required to repudiate an interventionist administration's too-active foreign policy. For, on second thought, the majority of the American people will soon realize that the Fascist vituperation of "Democracy" is really aimed, not at the American people or their ideal of self-government, but rather at the same aggregation of "economic royalists," in the world at large, at which the New Deal aims its shafts within the territorial jurisdiction of the United States; at the same inertias and iniquities of concentrated and preponderant economic power; and at a fairer distribution of the opportunities and rewards of fruitful labor upon the earth. The enemies of the German people and of Hitler are not really democracy. They are plutocracy, a ruthless and reckless capitalism; and the enormous preponderance, commercially and colonially speaking, of the pseudo-democratic world empires of Britain and France, better called "dempires" than democracies! And inasmuch as for twenty years, since Versailles and the totalitarian triumph of Democracy on the bloodiest fields of battle in the history of the world, republican and democratic statesmanship, conditioned by the ethics and journalism of capitalism, has tried in vain to stabilize peace, or guarantee even a minimum, endurable standard of living and of liberty to the masses of the Western World, and especially to the helpless national fragments of Central Europe, several of which have been visibly dying before our indifferent democratic eyes —most particularly Austria and the sundered fragments of the Austro-Hungarian Empire—is it necessarily a disaster that the Dionysian forces of Naziism are now moving to prepare? Or an evil thing that they should have a chance, perhaps, to do a better job of integrating the economy and the competitive nationalities of the Danubian Balkans? Let us remember that—

> "The old order changeth, giving place to New,
> Lest one good custom should corrupt the world!"

And ask: Have we truly ever had an honorable and just international order or system, worthy of our extravagant and costly efforts to preserve it? And can we ever have one until we can devise a system of law which provides adequately for internal and non-violent changes of territory and authority, as conditions and men's desires change?

The President's response to the moving events on the international stage, during the last three months, has been active and dangerous; and it has profoundly alarmed the Senate and the country. To recapitulate: His ringing rhetoric in denunciation of the enemies of "religion, democracy, and international good-faith," delivered in his Annual Message to the Congress on January 3rd, and in subsequent utterances; his impromptu re-orientation of American foreign policy in the direction of covert abandonment of the spirit and practice of moral and commercial neutrality in dealing with the armed and arming states and rival empires of the Old World; his administration's vast expansion of what is called the national defense, particularly the navy and the "air-arm" of both the Army and the Navy, for which over 500 million dollars, (in addition to the billion dollar plus annual appropriations for the maintenance of our expansive naval and military establishments), are now being asked of a bewildered Congress, to provide for an air-force of 6,000 military planes. And finally, on April 14th, by his open letters to the dictators in Berlin and Rome, his overt intervention in the imperial chess game of the Old World.

In the wide disturbance of American opinion occasioned by these alarming developments, abroad and at home, the puzzling question has arisen as to what authority in the Federal Government makes, in fact, —and what is constitutionally authorized to formulate and promulgate—American foreign and commercial policy? The recent disclosures of secret and official assistance rendered to an official French military mission in this country for the purpose of buying over 60 million dollars' worth of military aviation has brought this troublesome constitutional and political question of long standing into the foreground once again. The Executive, the Department of State, and the majority of journalistic commentators frequently speak, write, or act upon the assumption that the direction, control, and alteration of American foreign and commercial policy is an exclusive prerogative of the President, his advisors and appointees. Despite a recent egregious opinion of the Supreme Court that purports to derive the President's control over foreign affairs directly from the British Crown (as if the Continental Con-

gress, the Articles of Confederation, and their very active committees of correspondence and foreign affairs, including Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, John Jay, and C. C. Pinckney and others had never existed!), this opinion is constructed upon a juridical fiction, which a thorough study of American history must challenge in the name of Democracy and republicanism.

It is sufficient perhaps to point out—what appears to be frequently overlooked—that there is not a single line or phrase in the famous charter of the Federal Union of our liberties and national self-government that confers upon the President any authority to initiate, define, control—much less to alter—American foreign or commercial policy, in time of peace, without the express assent of the Senate or the Congress. James Madison, in a famous debate with Alexander Hamilton concerning this very question, declared it to be his opinion that foreign policy in a democracy partakes much more of a legislative than it does of an executive character. Every iota of constitutional authority possessed by the President in this important field of national endeavor derives from a simple—perhaps too simple!—assignment of power and duty to nominate and receive foreign ministers and ambassadors; and from the discretionary duty of ratifying the work which these diplomatic officers and agents are designated to do, namely, the concluding of treaties with foreign governments and nations on behalf of the United States of America. Even this authority is rigidly circumscribed by the restrictive clause "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate,"—or rather of two-thirds of the senators present and voting whenever a treaty is brought to the floor for the Senate's approval, rejection, or approval with reservations.

A careful reading of the facts, historical and constitutional, must lead to the conclusion that it was the unquestionable intention of the framers of the American Constitution to effect something like a democratic revolution in the matter of the control of foreign policy, as in other sovereign matters of government; and to surround the exercise of this most important function with very real senatorial and democratic safeguards, in order to protect the people, and the several states, against the sinister evils of secret Executive diplomacy and of a monarchical monopoly of foreign policy, with which far more than the history of the eighteenth century was stained. After mature reflection, the American Constitution-makers patently intended that the Senate should function as *an advisory and authoritative Executive Council* in the conduct of our affairs with foreign governments and peoples, and in the control and alteration of our foreign policy. Washington so understood the Constitution, and acted accordingly, personally consulting the Senate about treaty negotiations on more than one occasion. Later attempts on the part of the Executive to ignore this important constitutional principle and precedent—notably in the time of the first Roosevelt and of Woodrow Wilson—brought stalemate at home and stultification for America abroad—and may do so again. *The Senate is a constitutional partner in the direction and control of American foreign policy, which Presidents ignore at their peril.* Certainly no important alteration or pronouncement of American policy ought to be made without prior consultation of the President with at least the standing Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate—in which, as it seems to the writer, all of our living ex-Presidents ought to be offered an honorary membership, perhaps as a representative of the District of Columbia in which they have lived and which, to the chagrin of almost all thoughtful persons, has no representation in the Congress, whose disfranchised "ward" it is.

As to the matter of national commercial policy, the direct authority of Congress here is beyond doubt or dispute; for the power to control interstate and foreign commerce is among the most important of the powers expressly granted by Article I of the Federal Constitution to the Congress. The question, therefore, of whether, and when, we shall permit the sale and exportation of arms and munitions of war to foreign governments or persons—and under what conditions or terms—is incontrovertibly one for Congress—not the Executive—by law and regulation to determine. The Congress constitutionally proposes—but the President too often disposes, even here!

Thus, the very important and disturbing matter of arms-embargoes and munitions-sales to foreign powers, armed and arming to the eyes in fear or preparation of war, is not one for the Executive to dominate,—particularly when Congress is in session, and when, by emphatic and well-considered legislation, mandatory in spirit, it has thrice within recent years indicated its almost unanimous will to preserve a stricter and more honest impartiality of "Neutrality" and non-interventionism in the conduct or abetting of foreign conflict; and to suppress—so far as we dare sacrifice the ill-gotten profits—the dangerous traffic in absolute contraband of war between our shores and those of the ancient imperial rivals of Europe and Asia, with their far-flung intrigues and alliances, now girdling and exhausting themselves for another and still more dreadful, more murderous, lawless, and perhaps more barren Armageddon than that of yesteryear—which, by its unfortunate and ever-to-be-regretted participation, the United States of America under Woodrow Wilson served but to prolong and to confuse.

Can we keep out of it? Most assuredly we can, if we have one-half the intelligence of Jefferson and one-third of the patriotism of Washington! It is absurd to suppose that we are incompetent to avoid a repetition of the tragic blunders of 1917, or of devising a higher statesmanship than that of sliding or stumbling into another imperial duel of the Old World, within the brief space of twenty years. If Democracy as we know it cannot be saved by other means than international war, it cannot be saved in our lifetime. If it cannot be saved without reducing Europe to a shambles and imprisoning the Central European peoples in permanent subservience to political slavery and economic starvation, it is not worth saving at such a price. For the world cannot be saved for Democracy or Americanism by another blood-bath of peoples engaging in collective suicide and mass-murder. And those who lead the peoples in that direction will ultimately be accursed of God and man—however seductive the phrases and the self-deception by which they lead.

Golgotha '39

Out of the world's Gethsemane,
Up from the seeds of hate,
Borne by the angry pangs of War:
The Just shall some day free
Mankind from the tyrant's fate:
With Love, the everlasting Conqueror.

HOWELL SHEPARD.

Legislation, Revelation, Education

S. H. MARKOWITZ

"There ought to be a law," is the formula with which many if not most people would remedy every social evil and correct every undesirable condition in the political, industrial, or international realm. Somehow we assume that the moment we have, with pain and travail, if need be, through coercion and compulsion, if necessary, written down a prohibition or prescribed a formal regulation the problem is solved and that we will all live happily thereafter. Legislation is the specific which many would apply to every social ailment.

Another remedy almost as popular is revelation. Periodically there appears upon the scene of human activity, a "messenger bearing glad tidings." Ever since Moses brought down the ten commandments from the top of Mount Sinai a savior has arisen in every human crisis. Whenever humanity has found itself in a muddle from which extrication seemed utterly impossible, a revelation has come from on high to show the way of salvation for all time. A hero has arisen who, inspired from some mysterious and often supernatural source, has proclaimed a new gospel, enunciated a new doctrine or propagated a new version of the good life for which man is constantly striving.

Legislation and revelation! These are the twins upon which man has relied again and again only to be deceived each time. They are born in the womb of human dissatisfaction with the "situation as it is," conceived in the conviction that the Kingdom of Heaven is possible here on earth, and dedicated to the proposition that life, liberty, and happiness are the inalienable rights of every son of man. Yet they are not friendly to each other, as a rule. Like Jacob and Esau, they are constantly at strife with one another. He who knows the truth, that truth whose possession guarantees freedom, that truth which was once and for all time delivered to the saints, he is impatient with and intolerant of him who would have recourse to formal processes. On the other hand, he whose faith is built upon the doctrine that government shall be of laws and not of men, especially he whose soul does not burn feverishly over the evil in the world and whose heart is in the *status quo* where his treasure lies, he will be very impatient and even cruel with him who would by fiat and ex cathedra pronouncement make "justice roll down like waters and righteousness as a mighty stream."

John Calvin in Geneva in the 17th century was certain that law would save the world from sin; just as certain as Lenin in the 20th century. If only a society could be created in which the rule of righteousness would operate, men would ultimately become so accustomed to well-doing that wrong would be unthinkable. Strange as it may sound to our ears, the philosophy of John Calvin and of Nicolai Lenin is strikingly similar. Each sought to build a society in which law would train man to "do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with God." To Lenin, the term "God" meant something quite different from what it meant to Calvin. But the idea of the divine, even if the term itself is hated and despised,—the idea of the divine cannot be excluded from any scheme of salvation.

The dream-doctrine behind the Calvin and Lenin activities was the same, vastly different though the interpretation and translation of that dream-doctrine be. The history of Utopia-creators is a long and interesting one. Amana in Iowa and New Harmony in Indiana are but symbols of that fervent and passionate belief that the law can be engraved on the human heart, and that all from the least unto the greatest will eschew the evil and seek the good.

Occasionally a prophet will arise who, recognizing the unreliability of the remedy, will call out earnestly against it. Tolstoi was eighty-two when he died in 1910. The year before his death he predicted the World War and the emergence of dictatorships. He saw in his vision the silhouette of the Venus of modern life, Commercialism. She holds in her hand three torches:

1. War
2. Bigotry and hypocrisy
3. Law

Of the last named he speaks as follows: "That dangerous foundation of all unauthentic traditions which first does its fatal work in the family, then sweeps through the worlds of literature, art, and statesmanship." The fact that Tolstoi's prediction seems almost uncannily accurate shows how little attention was paid to his warning and how much reliance men persisted in placing in law.

And with similar persistence do men rely upon revelation. They are convinced that all truth essential to human need has been discovered long, long ago. It has not as yet been adequately proclaimed. The good news is always old. It reverts to the past; it harks back to some glorious ancestor, some heroic progenitor whose example mankind must emulate more closely in order to find salvation and security in an insecure and unsatisfactory world. Law is a feeble instrument; legislation cannot achieve the desired results. Government by revelation is the only law.

The scene has not changed through the centuries. The actors on the stage of humanity are different with the generations but the same tragi-comedy is regularly enacted. Legislation and revelation are the two most widely advertised remedies for the cure of society's ills.

Every session of Congress, every assembly of the state legislature produces a collection of new laws in the conviction that thus will men be trained to find their delight in the law of the Lord and to meditate therein day and night. And every new problem which arises to disturb and distress society calls forth a new savior who proclaims deliverance to the captives and recovery of sight to the blind. Father Divine, Adolph Hitler, and all the messengers of revelation who preceded them,—each is convinced that he has the remedy which will immediately cure society of all its ailments. And each time the remedy has failed. Isaiah did not succeed because we still join house to house and field to field. Jesus brought no relief from the burdens of Rome, and great multitudes are still without that abundant life of which he spoke. Repeatedly have saviors arisen to deliver mankind from bondage —Shabbatai Zevi and Brigham Young, Mohammed and Robert Owen—and the world is still unsaved. And mankind still goes on blunderingly, muddling

along without adequate or accurate knowledge as to where to go and how to get there.

Any attempt to get rid of legislators and messengers of revelation would simply involve the elimination of practically the entire human family. For we are all ready to legislate at a moment's notice—especially for others. And we are all preachers of doctrine and propagandists for this or that gospel, no matter how even-tempered and judicious we may appear. Clarence Darrow said that he divided his life into three sections. In the first period, he was passionately eager to save the world. In the second, he came to the conclusion that humanity was not worth saving. And in the third period, he decided that mankind was much better off than if he had saved it.

We cannot dispose of law and legislation. Lawlessness will produce the very anarchy from which the human family has been seeking for centuries to extricate itself. Neither are we in position to put a ban upon every messenger of revelation. Somehow in the very substructure of the soul there is the feeling that the future will be better than the past, that tomorrow must be brighter than today; and that only our weakness and our lack of courage lead us into a condition of defeatism.

Supine surrender in the presence of great and seemingly insurmountable obstacles may have been the recourse of individuals throughout the centuries. It was never the policy of the human race as a whole. When Shailer Matthews, Dean Emeritus of the University of Chicago Divinity School, said that theology was transcendentalized politics, he pointed to one technique for the preservation of human morale. There are now, as there always have been, others. In critical eras, these techniques take on the character of the supernatural and the cataclysmic. In more normal and scientific times they become what we might tentatively term that much abused and maligned thing, education.

What is education? The common cold has been voluminously described because we know so little about it. And education, though it has been an institution in human society since time immemorial, still baffles description. There are absolutes in the universe; two plus two make four, say the traditionalists. All is tentative; as far as our limited knowledge goes, two plus two make four; but absolutes are impossible, say the anti-traditionalists. And between these two extremes are innumerable gradations and divisions.

In the clash and confusion, there is always the tendency to seek refuge in the doctrine of infallibility. Skepticism concerning the human capacity to think becomes the escape by which we justify an infallibility that can be imposed by force. Education is brought under the control of legislatures or made subservient to one or another type of revelation. And thus our educational systems produce neither leaders nor teachers but stereotyped and wooden products of legislation or revelation.

The theological doctrine of the depravity of man is a natural foundation for those who are unwilling to rely upon the heavenly voice of the human soul. They lack confidence in the ability of man to develop moral and intellectual virtues independently. Forcible restraints by law or doctrinaire authority become the only safety measures against universal iniquity. The power of education to transform human nature is mistrusted. Coercion and compulsion become the recourse of those timid souls whose pompous and pietistic pronouncements are simply indications of a subconscious and deep-seated fear of inferiority.

The value of law or the virtue of revelation cannot be denied. In the training of children, a certain amount of coercion is absolutely essential. There are entirely too many youngsters of middle age who reveal a woeful lack of coercive values which the experience of the race suggests. But the assumed infallibility of lawmakers and self-appointed masters in society destroys whatever value may inhere in legislation and whatever virtue may reside in revelation.

Let us assume that legislation and revelation are the ultimate principles in the universe. How shall they be applied and made concrete in human life? The agents for the translation of law and the interpretation of Gospel are of ordinary flesh and blood. Their limitations and loyalties confine the most ideal law. Their perversities and possibilities condition the most sublime vision. We are all human beings through no choice of our own. All phenomena are subjective and every function has the indelible marks of the functionaire.

Yet it is the more educated human in whom our only hope lies. He will bring redemption from sin and salvation for the entire human family. He will open the eyes of the blind and release those who are in chains. Legislation and revelation will be among the tools which he will employ. They will be means to the desired end and not ends in themselves.

Who is the more educated human? He who has learned to do of his own accord what he might be compelled to do by law. This definition of the function of education formulated by the ancient scholar and sage has never been improved upon. He who would lead should possess a disciplined mind and a stout heart. He should be able to stand on his own feet intellectually and employ legislation and revelation for their intended use.

The scholar who speaks in all the tongues of man but is not a creatively intelligent spirit, the philanthropist who bestows all his goods upon the poor but is not a morally sensitive soul, the saint who gives his body to be burned but has not a high-minded outlook and a healthy tolerance,—these cannot be called leaders of men and saviors of mankind.

The educated man rejoices with the truth whether it shines from the annals of ancient revelation or through the seers of our own time. He hears all things, believes all things, hopes all things, endures all things. He knows in part and he predicts in part; but perfection is the quest of the ages, each one of which formulates its creed accordingly.

And now abide legislation, revelation, and education—these three. And the greatest of these is education.

Voices in the Wilderness

The jungle darkness holds its grip
On hearts and minds of men.
Let there be light! the braver cry
That we may walk again.

We are lost, unless we rise
There is no help from men
From tangled growth and earthbound feet
We rise, but fall again.

HANNA MOCK.

Intellectual Chastity

RANDALL S. HILTON

It has generally been believed that there is real value in being able to think. It is assumed also that educational institutions from the kindergarten to the university are for the purpose of teaching people to think. There is supposed to have been a real demand for thinkers. It was even popular once to believe that a modified Plato's Republic would be the best form of government, where men would be elected or appointed to office in recognition of their mental ability rather than because of political power or prestige. However, an examination of our educational system reveals that its major contribution is a quantity of information and the establishment of more or less orthodox mental patterns. The effective propaganda against the "Brain Trust" demonstrates the fact that mental ability is still inferior to party regularity. It is not intelligence and originality that are demanded but rather compliance with the accepted economic, political, and religious thought-patterns that have been preserved and presented to us by the school, the political party, and the church.

Our minds have been put in mental strait-jackets. We are unable to understand or appreciate the mental freedom necessary for genuine thinking. We have not achieved that mental maturity so essential to the acceptance of the privilege and the responsibility of creative thinking. Too many are still in mental infancy. They have to be bottle-fed or spoon-fed. Their mental nourishment must be strained and practically pre-digested. Others are still in the adolescent stage of mental experience. They approach the potentialities of thought with fear and curiosity. And of those who do reach maturity and do understand the pregnant possibilities of thought, too many refuse to accept the responsibility, and so return to the shelter and security of their adolescence where they can play at being mature without having to face its consequences.

Even in mental infancy and adolescence we get a certain amount of cerebral exercise and can learn to do difficult mental gymnastics. But we have done nothing creative. We may rearrange the speculations of others so that they appear new. These we find as alluring as they are unprovable. It is easier for us to be contented and comfortable if we accept the beautiful and logical speculations which are provided by theologians, philosophers, and scientists, than it is to build our own understanding of life through the hard mental work of analyzing and interpreting our own experience. We would rather mimic the thoughts of others than to struggle crudely with independent thinking.

We refer sneeringly to the "intellectuals" and the "intelligentsia." Perhaps we should, but not because they differ with us but because they, too, are bound by tradition and custom. For over two thousand years we have accepted the Aristotelian laws of logic. They are the rules of the game and as long as we accept them we must accept their conclusions. No difficulty arises as long as we remain in the realm of abstraction. But there is no end of trouble when we try to put the results into operation in our daily life. Such glorious generalizations and deductions as the omniscience and omnipotence of the gods, the expanding or the contracting of the universe, the inherent good or evil of man, can be demonstrated if we follow the rules of logic and assume infinity.

Suppose we have a boy on a bicycle riding ten miles an hour and an airplane going 100 miles per hour. Give the bicycle a hundred miles head start. When the airplane has gone 100 miles the bicycle will have gone 10 miles, the airplane 10 miles the bicycle 1 mile, the airplane 1 mile the bicycle 1/10 mile, and so on *ad infinitum*. Logically they will never pass. But this assumes infinity of time and space. The airplane does pass the bicycle because we are dealing with finite time and finite space. We can speculate about infinity but we cannot experience it. And in our finite experience, arbitrary laws of logic serve often to betray us.

We must be honest with ourselves in our thinking. If we succumb to tempting syllogisms, or allow our thinking to be blocked by the dogma of orthodox logic, or start with undemonstrable assumptions then we are betraying our experiences, are dishonest with ourselves, and disloyal to our intellects. Not to work at this process of experiential thinking is to stunt the growth of our minds and keep us in intellectual infancy or adolescence. Lack of mental will power allows us to prostitute and seduce our minds by yielding to the demands of tradition or to the wiles of an enticing logic.

Anatole France once said, " 'Tis a great infirmity to think. God preserve you from it, my son, as He has preserved His greatest saints and the souls whom He loves with especial tenderness and destines to eternal felicity." France knew that so-called orthodox thinking was only mimicry and imitation. He knew what it was to suffer the jeers and jibes of those who could not remain calm in the face of unorthodox thought.

It is not easy, but it is necessary if we are to live adventurously, to turn our minds away from the beautiful deluding deductions of abstraction and speculation, and frankly face the facts of experience. Experiential thinking is painful and socially dangerous. But these growing pains of the mind can result in a full intellectual maturity which will enable us to enjoy the responsibility of creative thought. Then we can be honest, sincere, and loyal in our search for satisfying values.

It is wishful thinking to believe that these values can be achieved by logic based upon abstractions which cannot be experienced. It leads to rationalization and misinterpretation of experience for the purpose of justifying our speculations. Experiential thought, however, while it may not lead to logical systems will be practical, and the values it achieves will be experienced.

Partitions

We have so many Gods,
We burn our incense at such various shrines,
And pry the smouldering furnace-bed
Of petty differences
And partial reasonings,
With so great a fever;
We do but swell the crimson vapour
Of our mental wars,
Until it clouds the logic
Of the singular Power.
We build a wall around us,
And go at last, unreconciled,
To our death.

GEORGE R. SMALL.

The Free Individual and the Free Society

VICTOR S. YARROS

Several decades ago a British chancellor of the exchequer and a Gladstonian Liberal, exclaimed, "We are all Socialists now!" He thus answered a conservative critic of the revenue and tax measures of the Liberal party of that day, which was accused of too many concessions to paternalism and Socialism. Today, truly, he who is not a Socialist, or almost a Socialist, finds himself the pet of the reactionaries, even though he insists that he is a good and consistent liberal. One needs only to mention the odd case of Walter Lippmann!

The *laissez-faire* policy is dead and discredited. The notion that government can and must stay out of the economic field, and act only as a policeman or umpire, is too preposterous to deserve the slightest attention. Social security, collective bargaining, the guaranty of bank deposits, strict regulation of security issues, the recognition of picketing and primary boycotting—these and other measures illustrate the irresistible advance of Socialist ideas and the decline and burial of plutocratic individualism and one-sided libertarianism.

Yet the liberal and the democrat cannot rejoice in the prospect of *complete* success for Socialism. "Totalitarian" collectivism, they dread and abhor. Soviet Russia, we are assured, is 90 per cent Socialistic, but certain features of Russian Socialism are repugnant and odious to liberals and democrats. The dictatorship of, or rather for, the proletariat; the suppression of all civil liberties; the one-party system; the savage vindictiveness behind the purges and the mass executions, and the consequent necessity of underground plotting and conspiring by opponents of the regime have saddened and disillusioned hosts of liberals who welcomed with enthusiasm the first Russian revolution of 1917.

Socialism without democracy; Socialism without individual and group and local freedom; Socialism without free and unhampered intellectual discussion and criticism is Socialism for the stomach, but not Socialism for the mind or heart of civilized and cultivated men and women. No enlightened liberal can worship the State, glorify brute force, sacrifice the individual, acquiesce in the restoration of absolutism in government. Hence, the liberals, democrats, and progressives are bound to make it perfectly clear that the Socialism *they* will support and approve must repudiate and shed these features. Socialism must be compatible with freedom for the individual and with democracy in the State.

The time has come for the revival of the gospel of genuine individualism and "philosophical" and pacific Anarchism. Our slogan should be: Back to Mill, Spencer, Emerson, Sumner, Cobden, Morris, Bastiat, Proudhon, but with important reservations and revisions, since economic and social conditions have changed greatly in the last few decades, and any individualism which opposes trade unionism, social taxation, and social legislation, industrial and economic democracy is today a sham and a mockery.

Thoughtful readers will find stimulation, profit, delight and relief in Prof. P. W. Bridgman's remarkable book, *Society and the Intelligent Individual*. This work is more significant than most reviewers seem to have realized. To appreciate it, a certain point of view or approach is requisite. Professor Bridgman writes as a philosophical Anarchist would on the problems dealt with in his book. He rejects all political superstition, all mystical moonshine, all hypocritical professions, and asks the candid question: What should be the attitude of the free, intelligent individual toward the State? Should the individual bow down to the tyrant who says: "I am the State," or to an oligarchy that employs the jargon of democracy and ruthlessly pursues its own selfish aims, or to an accidental majority composed of heterogeneous elements and representing no definite philosophy of politics and government? His answer is "egocentric"; that is, the individual is entitled to consult his own interests and his own preferences. The ultimate appeal, unfortunately, is to force. Majorities can be as despotic and as intolerant as individual autocrats. The reasonable individual, therefore, will be prudent and discreet; he will not defy the majority save in extreme cases. He will make concessions to public opinion for the sake of peace and security, or for the sake of his job and work. He will coöperate politically and otherwise with the forces of light, and fight the forces of darkness and reaction. He will be a realist and a pragmatist, in short, and permit no false hopes or vain illusions to shape his conduct.

It is clear to the intelligent individual that the existing order is neither just nor rational. He must, of course, decide for himself just what changes are requisite; and he will *want* to do what he can to promote the desirable reforms. The intelligent person is not indifferent to social problems; he is not selfish in a narrow sense of the term. He knows that he cannot be happy, secure or free in a world torn by strife, hate, and prejudice; and that indignant resentment of wrong and oppression is natural and human. He may not *love* humanity, but he detests cruelty and injustice. He may not care to make quixotic sacrifices, but he will certainly, upon occasion, subordinate his personal comfort and peace to the common good. The free and intelligent individual, in short, is not without good will and a keen sense of righteousness. Moreover, his convictions are as dear to him as, or dearer than, his material possessions or his place and position in the social scheme. He will work and fight for his convictions, though without fanaticism or blind passion. He will not expect more of average human nature than it is capable of giving, and he will be disposed to make allowances for the influence of environment, class and early education. But he will not talk foolishly about personal regeneration, personal virtue and purity, despite vicious and demoralizing institutions. The individual is molded by institutions, and he in turn modifies institutions and endeavors to realize in and through them his sense of justice and humanity. The intelligent individual will not be content to *pray* for reform; he will *work* for it. He will not profess to solve problems by raising greater and deeper problems. He will take stock of his resources, his knowledge, his ruling preferences, and act according to his nature and temperament.

We certainly need such a gospel as Professor

Bridgman's at this juncture. Old superstitions and ancient myths are giving way to new superstitions and new quackeries or fallacies. Religion is a diminishing or vanishing influence. Millions profess beliefs they do not entertain or think of acting upon under any circumstances. Rebarbarization threatens contemporary society. The tiger and the ape in man are reasserting themselves after some centuries of what we call progress and civilization. We must re-orient ourselves and know where we stand, what we stand *for*, and what we are prepared to *do* for the cause of civilization. We have to seek guidance in the social sciences, inexact as they are, in human experience, in our own personal experience, and in the still small voice of reason and conscience. The intelligent individuals, renouncing millenial expectations, feel that they *can* gradually establish an intelligent and decent society. Accidents, calamities, mass madness may retard and impede the emergence of the intelligent society. The long view, however, inspires hope, not despair. In any event, we find satisfaction in our very *efforts* to promote the reign of justice and righteousness—and we need no other or higher incentives or sanctions.

The Study Table

A Study of Empire

WHY WERE THEY PROUD? *Foreword by Harold H. Mann. Published by The Pacifist Research Bureau, 51 Ruskin Walk, Herne Hill, London. 1/- net.*

This handy and compact brochure of 143 pages, including Index, is a symposium by Harold Bing, Marjorie Dixon, Robert Entwistle, F. S. Marston, Reginald Reynolds, J. Allen Skinner, John W. Strange, Wilfred Wellock and Alun Williams. Its eleven chapters preserve as much of a unified movement to a conclusion as though one mind had created the whole argument. Following the introductory chapter we are led through the whole vile labyrinth of the world's imperialisms, both ancient and modern. As "Pioneers of Modern Imperialism," we have here traced for us the whole scrap to get control of the New World and America by the European imperialisms of the sixteenth century. We know of no finer detailed description and portrayal of that abomination, the African slave trade, than here given. Chattel slavery's annihilation was followed by expanding capitalism, sometimes even more dire in its effects on exploited peoples than slavery had been.

Of course the "Flag Follows Trade," the nations that are strong enough engage in "The Scramble for Africa," until they discover that "Empire Is Debt." Splendid is the chapter tracing the way that debt demands, first, political and, then, military control, with the complicated system of mandates, protectorates, tariffs, and complete economic subjugation. Do you want to see presented in clearest outline the fountain source of the war system that threatens NOW to devour the earth? Here it is in all its glaring horror.

A sixth chapter is devoted to "The Mandates System," another to "Post-War Colonial Policy," still another to "Conditions of the Subject Peoples," and a ninth to "The Effects of the Colonial System upon the 'HOME' Country." When one is tempted to vent his wrath on Hitler, turn to these chapters, or the one on "The Colonial Peoples and Civilization," and realize that Mussolini and Hitler are merely copying the methods for subjugating their neighboring states that British imperialists have used in India and South Africa, or French imperialists have used among their "mandates." In fact, "the civilization of acquisition and aggression" has not merely failed, it now threatens to engulf all peoples worse than would barbarism. Democracy, defined as the paradox that would allow all people to have freedom of choice, even though they choose the exact opposite to what we think might be good for them, is our hope.

In fact, the book concludes, we must get over this idea that we are to impose material or other so-called improvements on any people. If they want our industrial set-up and its output, let them do it themselves as with Russia today, not have poker, bridge, and jazz bands impressed upon them as France has done with Annam. Democracy, too, can only be buttressed with a thorough-going pacifism toward all peoples. "Militarism and pacifism both have their risks. . . .The risks of militarism are shown in the records of history," wars that get increasingly worse, maimed bodies, warped minds.

> For what are these risks taken? Only to perpetuate a social system and ideology that lead on to fresh wars, each worse than the last. The risks of pacifism differ in the object for which they are undertaken. Its worst risk is failure—failure of mankind to respond to the example of a few. But even such failure could not be worse than that other failure—the inevitable failure of violence, which we are even now experiencing and seem destined to experience in tragic measure. On the other hand, the prospect, however slight, of our success, is the one hope of the world: the narrow and dangerous path that we must dare to walk if we would lead humanity to its salvation.

How many follow in this train?

GEORGE MAYCHIN STOCKDALE

An Important Historical Document

THE IMPEACHMENT OF GOVERNOR WILLIAM SULZER. *By Jacob Alexis Friedman. 284 pp. New York: Columbia University Press. $3.50.*

To this day the name of William Sulzer "evokes in the public mind the memory of an independent governor 'railroaded' out of office by a revengeful boss"—a friend of the people, a champion of good government frustrated by a corrupt and vindictive machine. Was it true? While the entire story of the Sulzer episode cannot be told in all its ramifications unless the public and "secret" records of Tammany Hall would be produced for free examination—something that could not be done as long as we remain a democracy or until Tammany Hall becomes a truly democratic institution in fact as well as in name—Mr. Friedman has made an attempt to reconstruct the Sulzer case by means of public documents, official investigations, memoirs, contemporary newspapers and periodicals, and the lesson to be learned from this study is: *that a product of corrupt politics and of a corrupt political machine is not the suitable person to reform political life.*

William Sulzer was born in Elizabeth, New Jer-

sey, of German and Scotch-Irish parentage. Poverty forced his family to move and settle on the East Side in New York. William attended night classes at Cooper Union and made himself a name as a gifted orator. Soon he attracted the attention of John Reilly, Tammany leader of the old 14th Assembly District, and, upon the latter's advice, William took up the study of law. In a few years William became a lawyer and an indefatigable campaigner for Tammany Hall. In 1889 he obtained his reward: he was elected to the Assembly, reëlected, and in 1893 became Democratic speaker. Throughout his Assembly career William was "an obedient tool of Richard Croker," boss of Tammany Hall. In 1894 William was sent to Congress from the 10th Congressional District. In the House he became known as a typical spellbinder, acquiring the epithet, "Seltzer," and as a champion of the underdog and of many unpopular causes: independence of Cuba, justice for Jews in Russia, direct election to Senate, more equitable compensation for American labor, etc. In 1910 Sulzer became chairman of the important Foreign Relations Committee. His record in Congress won the praise of many dignitaries, including President Wilson who characterized Sulzer as a man showing "capacity and discretion of a very fine sort." Nonetheless, Sulzer remained a faithful follower of Tammany Hall, as will be seen from his remark in a speech at Tammany Hall on February 13, 1902: "Tammany is Democracy. Tammany will go on forever—to its truer and grander destiny."

In 1912 the Progressive Party entered politics in New York State and offered Oscar S. Straus, Jewish philanthropist, as its candidate for governor. Sulzer, who took such an active part in the campaign in Congress for the abrogation of the old treaty with Russia, was put forward at the Democratic Party state convention in Syracuse on October 3, 1912, as the ideal candidate to oppose Straus, and won the nomination. A chorus of approval greeted the selection. Sulzer was hailed as "a man of the people" by such men as Woodrow Wilson, William J. Bryan, and William R. Hearst. A discordant sound, however, could already be heard then in the midst of the din of praise, for the New York *Tribune* wanted to know on what matter "vital to Tammany, Sulzer had ever shown his independence." The division among the Republicans assured the election of Sulzer. In his first speech after election he announced that he would be an independent Governor, "in fact as well as in name," and that the only boss he would take orders from was "the man under his hat." To show that he meant business he soon appointed a Committee of Inquiry which launched "an investigation of the state administrative departments" with a view to eliminating graft, waste, unnecessary expenditures, useless jobs, etc. Upon receiving the Committee's reports charging graft in their departments, Governor Sulzer summarily dismissed the chiefs of the Prison and Highways departments. For months Sulzer and Tammany chieftains were bickering over the appointment of new chiefs. This was the first *visible* symptom of the feud. The next move that raised the tension was Sulzer's signing of the Jackson's Full Crew bill, supported by organized labor but bitterly contested by the railroads. According to Sulzer, his courage to place "man above dollars" arrayed the railroads and other corporate interests and newspapers under their control against him, who at once began plotting his political destruction. Another bone of contention was Sulzer's appointment of John Mitchell as Commissioner of Labor in the enlarged Department of Labor. Rejected by the legislature, Sulzer reappointed Mitchell during the legislature's recess, a move which was held improper by the Attorney General and the Supreme Court. The feud reached its climax when Sulzer launched his active campaign on behalf of a state-wide direct primary law. "If people were qualified to elect their officials," he declared, "they were competent also to nominate them." In his special message to the legislature on April 10, 1913, he offered his bill proposing the complete abolition of the convention system, the inclusion of all state offices under the operation of the direct primaries, the prohibition of the use of party funds in primary elections, and other drastic reforms. The Republicans were ready to support Sulzer's bill if he were willing to eliminate the clause abolishing the convention system. To this Sulzer retorted: "My bill or nothing." This, in the reviewer's opinion, was a grave tactical error as it contributed largely to his political undoing. The Republicans now turned against Sulzer, joined with the Democrats in defeating this bill, as well as many other important bills later.

Tammany Hall was now determined to "liquidate" Sulzer, by means foul or fair. The entire "political career and private life" of Sulzer were searched for "compromising" clues. Charges were circulated that as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee in Congress he was engaged in secret deals with concession hunters in Central America. A suit for breach of promise of marriage was filed against Sulzer by a Philadelphia department store cloak model. But the move that "liquidated" Sulzer was the legislature's appointment of the Fawley Legislative Investigating Committee to investigate Sulzer's administration. During the course of its hearings it was revealed that Sulzer failed to account in his sworn statement for numerous campaign contributions, which were diverted to his personal bank accounts and stock speculation. Instead of coming forward and offering straightforward explanations, Sulzer simply "resorted to hysterical denunciations and sought shelter behind technicalities." On August 11, 1913, Aaron J. Levy, leader of the Democratic majority in the Assembly, offered a motion for the impeachment of Governor Sulzer "for wilful and corrupt conduct in office and high crimes and misdemeanors." The motion was carried 64 to 30. In the heat of the discussions, an announcement was made that Mrs. Sulzer "had assumed responsibility for acts charged to the Governor." That this proved of little help to the Governor will be seen from the fact that the impeachment articles were adopted by 79 to 29. Sulzer, furthermore, failed to keep his promise to present himself as witness in his own defense before the High Court of Impeachment and prove the charges as a frame-up.

While it is undoubtedly true that Tammany Hall would have never set in motion the Fawley Committee—which was made possible, by the way, and "successful" by information supplied by a confidant of Sulzer, who acted at the same time as the latter's campaign manager in his race for Governor and as a trusted servant of Tammany Hall—had Governor Sulzer been a pliant tool of Tammany Hall, the impeachment of Sulzer had proved that Sulzer himself was far from be-

ing the angel and "friend of the people" that he claimed to be. While he refused to be dictated to by Boss Murphy, he did not hesitate to take dictations from Boss Hearst, who through Sulzer endeavored to realize his own political ambitions; and while yelling "graft" and "corruption" he himself was not free from their taint . . . Sulzer's failure to defend himself like a man did not add many friends to the cause of Tammany Hall but it alienated many of his staunch friends. Theodore Roosevelt, in spurning Sulzer's attempt to gain the Progressive Party's nomination for Governor in 1914, said: "It is useless to expect a public servant to wage war on corruption if his own record is vulnerable." And Mr. Friedman more aptly epitomizes the feelings of thousands of progressives in his concluding sentence: "No man can afford to pit himself against a powerful political organization unless his own record is above reproach." The impeachment of Sulzer cost Tammany Hall four years of misrule of New York City but Sulzer paid a higher price—*political oblivion.* How the reviewer wishes that this were the early fate of every corrupt politician in our local, state, and national legislative assemblies—but he is afraid that this would and could not happen unless and until our political parties are rid of boss rule and reconstituted along truly democratic lines.

The Impeachment of Governor William Sulzer is an important historical document as well as a timely call for a political housecleaning.

MICHAEL B. SCHELER

The Field

(*Continued from page* 66)

man second may be nearing their climax.

Mussolini has proclaimed himself the protector of Islam, and an equestrian statue of him, in that pose, prances with drawn sword in Libya's capital. A rising in one or more of the Mohammedan dependencies of France might further this by no means always "bloodless" war. In this ugly framework the Palestinian Arabs, still in rebellion, refuse any compromise, while the Jews stand by their undeniable rights.

The British Government, bent on appeasement, measures the forces that face it. The Arabs are numerous, and, thanks to their proximity to several vital strategic points, have their power of pressure. The Jews are few, but they enjoy in the United States a measure of influence. The Arabs, I take it, will be appeased—in some degree, whereupon they will ask for more.

But if Palestine is a pawn in the European struggle, it is also the most readily available of the few havens of refuge open to the Jews. The most desperate problem that confronts organized humanity, if any vestige of it survives, is to find promptly an asylum and honorable work for Hitler's victims.

There were 600,000 of them in the old Germany; Vienna has 200,000 more, and there are those of the Sudetenland also. They have been robbed of their property; barred from every avenue through which they could gain a living; tortured in concentration camps and exposed to every indignity that neurotic malice can invent.

From merchants and bankers down to the simplest manual laborers, not a man among them has work in Vienna, and in that city alone during the first four months of the Anschluss 7,000 of them committed suicide. Where are they to go, when their fellow-Jews in happier lands have taxed themselves to buy their right to quit?

France to her lasting honor has taken, with some "Aryan" refugees, a total of 200,000 and can take no more. The British welcome has extended (including a few "Aryan" fugitives) only to 15,000. Very slowly the dominions will accommodate a few thousand more. The more romantic possibilities, British Guiana, San Domingo, Alaska, and Madagascar, are all of them highly speculative.

In this situation it is an intolerable tragedy that Palestine, at this moment of all others, should be virtually closed. It has received, in the last twenty years, some 460,000 Jews. Gradually, as their plantations mature and their industries develop, it might, without overcrowding or injury to the Arabs, accommodate a total that might touch two millions. The closing of its doors to thousands of German-Jewish children, to whom the Zionists had offered an asylum and a school, was a callous act of timidity. They, at least, could do no harm to the Arabs.

Any government that really felt its responsibility as a Christian and European power to clear our species from this load of guilt, would not merely have allowed the Zionist Jews to help the helpless; it would have backed them, protected them, and if necessary subsidized them in their effort.

The real question that centers in Palestine is, therefore, that of Jewish immigration. It cannot be argued that the absorptive capacity of this country is exhausted. On the contrary, each year many hundreds of acres of orange groves, already planted, begin to bear their marketable crops. At this stage they call for labor. If the stream of Jewish immigration ceases, then the owners of these trees will have to employ Arab labor, and all the evils of the exploitation of a backward by an advanced race will aggravate the present troubles.

Nothing in this long controversy has justified the Arab contention that the coming of the Jews has injured them. Most of the Zionist settlements arose on vacant and derelict land. One must have seen, as I have, the sand dunes that they have turned into orange groves, the marshes they have drained, the bare wastes that they have tamed to realize what a miracle faith and science have performed.

The most exact reckonings could never find more than 200 Arab families who had been dispossessed. They were offered alternative lands, but preferred work in the towns. For the rest, the coming of the Jews has turned a stagnant Oriental backwater into a thriving modern community. The Jews have raised the level of wages several times over, and with it the whole standard of life of the Arab population.

Thanks to the Jewish taxpayers, the Arabs have roads and social service which they could never have provided from their own resources. One could not argue that the League, as it is today, would have the right to decide such an issue and override the will of the Arab princes. But in its first years it was the nearest approach to a court of all mankind that humanity has yet seen.

What, then, should we wish the British Government to do? Open the gates of Palestine to refugees from Germany as far as economic prudence permits, and a little further. Then, if need be, it must face the axis and its Arab tools, and defend these people whom the League has put under its charge. It should help the Arab peasants constructively by a scheme of land purchase and irrigation for their sole benefit. That, rather than yielding to the terrorism of the landed magnates, is the way to make a contented Arab population.

Finally, it should assist the Arab states to achieve their dreams of federation. If a great federated Arabia existed, the Arabs would realize at last how much they owe to the British and French, who broke the Turkish yoke under which they lay. The tiny fringe of territory which the Jews possess would then be seen, in its true dimensions, as an insignificant corner of the vast Arab estate. If this project is too vast for instant realization, one might begin with the three states under British influence, Iraq, Trans-Jordan and Palestine. A diversion of the latter into Arab and Jewish zones or states, difficult today, would then be easy.

This desperate problem cannot be solved by standing still and even less by retreating. It can be solved only by a bold creative advance. The gates of this refuge must be thrown open to the persecuted. But if that is done, the Arabs also must profit by a constructive agrarian policy and by federation.

—Article in the Baltimore *Sun,* republished by Christian Friends of Palestine.

The Real Presence

He was a Jew, from Galilee,
Whom once the rulers slew.
A Jew, reviled, rejected, slain,
Is he,—a bleeding Christ again—
Wherever yet may be
A scorned and hounded—Jew.

ROBERT WHITAKER.

The Churchman.